

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 28 2004***Intellectual Property Section
Law Department***FAX COVER SHEET**

DATE: August 28, 2004

TO: EXAMINER SHARMA, S. 703-305-5298
(ADDRESSEE'S NAME) (EXTENSION)
ART UNIT 2684 703-872-9306
(LOCATION) (FAX NUMBER)

FROM: MATTHEW C. LOPPNOW (847) 523-2585
(SENDER'S NAME) (EXTENSION)

RE: APPLICATION NO. 09/614,026 APPEAL REPLY BRIEF

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGE(S) 6 (INCLUDING THIS PAGE)

NOTICE: This facsimile transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. It is intended only for the person(s) to whom it is addressed. Unauthorized use, disclosure, copying or distribution may expose you to legal liability. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (collect) to arrange for return of the documents received and any copies made. Thank you.

*Personal Communications Sector
600 North U.S. Highway 45, AN 475
Libertyville, IL 60048
Phone: (847) 523-2322 Facsimile: (847) 523-2350*

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 28 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5	APPLICANT: HOPPER, S. et al.	EXAMINER: Sharma, S.
	SERIAL NO.: 09/614,026	GROUP: 2684
	FILED: July 11, 2000	CASE NO.: PF01949NA
10	ENTITLED: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DETERMINING A PRO-ACTIVE REGION OF A MOBILE AD HOC NETWORK	

15 Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

APPEAL REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.193 (a)

25 Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir,

30 In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on June 28, 2004, Applicants submit the present Reply Brief.

Appl. No. 09/614,026
Atty. Docket No. PF01949NA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
	II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
5	III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	3
	IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	3
	V.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION	3
	VI.	ISSUES.....	3
	VII.	GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS.....	4
10	VIII.	ARGUMENT	4

Appl. No. 09/614,026
Atty. Docket No. PF01949NA

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The Examiner's Answer correctly acknowledges the real party in interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The Examiner's Answer correctly acknowledges the related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

The Examiner's Answer correctly acknowledges the status of the claims.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The Examiner's Answer incorrectly identifies the status of amendments as incorrect. In particular, in the "Status of Amendments" section, Applicants asserted no amendments were made to the claims after the September 10, 2003 Final Office Action. However, the Examiner's Answer alleges, "The amendment after final rejection filed on 2/9/04 has not been entered." To the contrary, no Amendment After Final Rejection was filed on February 9, 2004. Only a Response After Final Rejection was filed on February 9, 2004 and the Response did not include any amendments. Thus, there are no amendments in an Amendment After Final Rejection for entry.

V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The Examiner's Answer correctly acknowledges the summary of the invention.

VI. ISSUES

The Examiner's Answer correctly acknowledges the issues.

Appl. No. 09/614,026
Atty. Docket No. PF01949NA

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The Examiner's Answer acknowledges the grouping of the claims.

5

VIII. ARGUMENT

Applicants maintain that Robert et al. does not disclose or suggest selecting a first portion of a plurality of users to be within a pro active region based upon positional and topographic information and maintaining information on the users selected to be within a pro active region, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 26.

The "network topography" mentioned in Robert et al. is not the claimed topographic information. In particular, the claimed "topographic information" is defined in the present specification at page 11, lines 2-20, as being formations that may interfere with communications. The network topography mentioned in Robert et al. is directed to the actual ad hoc network, not formations that may interfere with communications. Thus, the disclosure of network topography is not the disclosure of topographic information.

The Examiner's Answer attempts to introduce a new ground of rejection by using an undated photocopy Webster's English Dictionary to define "topography." This new ground and definition is incorrect. In particular, the dictionary definition only discusses "topography" in general. It does not define the "network topography" disclosed in Robert et al. It further does not define the claimed "topographic information." The new ground also completely ignores Applicants' express definition of "topographic information" in the specification. Thus, the new ground of rejection is incorrect.

Applicants also maintain that the statement in Robert et al. of, "transceiver characteristics may be altered according to environment surroundings, terrain, or other factors," does not amount to accessing topographic information and selecting a plurality of users based on topographical information. In particular, altering transceiver characteristics is not selecting a plurality of users.

Furthermore, Applicants maintain that Robert et al. does not disclose maintaining information on users selected to be in a pro active region. In particular, Roberts et al only

Appl. No. 09/614,026
Atty. Docket No. PF01949NA

discloses that the environmental surroundings and terrain are only considered when data transfer is performed, not for the creation of a pro active region.


Thus, Robert et al. does not disclose or suggest selecting a first portion of a plurality of users to be within a pro active region based upon positional and topographic information and maintaining information on the users selected to be within a pro active region, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 26.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, and 26 define patentable subject matter. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, kindly reverse and vacate the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 26 under 35 USC § 102, with instructions for the Examiner to allow Claims 1-7, 9-18 and 20-26.

CONCLUSION

In view of the discussion above, the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly reverse and vacate the rejections of claims 1, 12, and 26, with instructions for the Examiner to allow claims 1-7, 9-18 and 20-26 to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,


Matthew C. Loppnow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,314

Dated: August 28, 2004

Phone No. (847) 523-2585

Fax No. (847) 523-2350
Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048